

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 520

SO 000 426

TITLE Institute in African and Afro-American Culture.
Director's Report.
INSTITUTION Georgia State Coll., Savannah.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau
of Educational Personnel Development.
PUB DATE 21 Jul 69
NOTE 69p.
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.55
DESCRIPTORS *African American Studies, African Culture, African
History, *Disadvantaged Youth, Inservice Teacher
Education, *Institutes (Training Programs), Negro
Culture, *Negro History, Reports, Social Studies,
Summer Institutes, *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

An EPDA Institute, held June 10 to July 21, 1969, is described in this report detailing objectives, activities, staff, participants, and results. Based on the needs for inclusion of African and Afro-American materials in the curriculum, and for a more effective approach to the problems of the disadvantaged learner, the specific objectives of the institute were: 1) to strengthen participants' backgrounds in the above cultures; 2) to increase understanding of the environmental influences operating on disadvantaged learners; and 3) to improve participants' abilities to develop and use instructional units in this area which would respond to the needs of disadvantaged youth. The two courses offered, African Backgrounds of Negro History, and Materials and Methods of Teaching the Disadvantaged, utilized lectures, field trips, and an opportunity for participants to construct and tryout units in local high school classes. Administration of the Black History Test and semantic differential measures indicated that participants' knowledge and understanding of Black culture were significantly increased and that attitudes can be modified by cognitive learning. A profile of the 26, predominantly Southern, participants is appended, along with results of the above two tests. (JLB)

ED0 45520

PS

SEP 3 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Directors' Report

Institute In African & Afro-American Culture

June 10, 1969
(Beginning Date)

July 21, 1969
(Ending Date)

Dr. Hanes Walton, Jr. Associate Professor of Political Science

Savannah State College

Savannah, Georgia

SP 000 426

SP003129

I. Introduction

The program of the Institute was designed to meet the need for the inclusion of African and Afro-American materials in the school curriculum and the need for a more understanding and competent approach to the problems of the disadvantaged learner. Accordingly, the Institute focused upon the following objectives: (1) strengthening participants' backgrounds in African and Afro-American Cultures; (2) increasing participants' understanding of the environmental factors (economic, social and psychological) which contribute to the educational difficulties of disadvantaged learners and (3) improving participants abilities to develop and use instructional units around Afro-American topics which would speak to the needs of disadvantaged youth.

The Institute attempted to achieve the above objectives through the scheduling of appearances by guest lecturers and consultants who had special qualifications in fields related to the Institutes' program. In addition, field trips were planned to places contemporary and historic interest in terms of the three subject areas covered by the Institute's program. The courses offered were: History 501. African Backgrounds of Negro History; and Educ. 547. Materials and Methods of Teaching the Disadvantaged. History 501 was not given for credit but was made a requirement for participants because of the importance of African Backgrounds in understanding the role and position of the Negro throughout his sojourn in this country. In the Education course, participants were given the opportunity

to utilize their new knowledge and information about Africa and Afro-American Cultures to construct units and try them out in the local high school and in the high school classes of Savannah State College's Upward Bound Project. They were to develop units, teach them (for one week) to one class, then revise them and re-teach them to different classes. In this way, the substantive content of the program would be directly and immediately related to the classroom situation.

II. Operation of the Program

A. Planning

On the whole, the planning phase of the Institute proceeded according to the original proposal. Efforts were made through surveys and through consultations with college staff, local public school officials and community leaders to determine more specifically the educational needs of this area, and the resources which were available for meeting them. These surveys and consultations sought especially to establish the extent and seriousness of the educational lacks which the Institute's program would attempt to overcome. For example, our surveys revealed that a large percentage of the pupils in the area high schools possessed many of the characteristics of the disadvantaged learner, and that courses in African and Afro-American Cultures were conspicuously absent from the curricula of the schools. In our consultations we sought to determine how well the educational preparation of local teachers appeared to equip them for coping with the problems of disadvantaged youth and of understanding the position of Afro-Americans in American society. Our consultations also sought information about any programs in being or contemplated which dealt with the above problems.

Our consultations served to confirm the need for the three-pronged approach which we were following. They revealed that there was very little in the educational background of most of the teachers which would equip them to cope realistically with the problem of educating disadvantaged (or advantaged) youth for living in a multi-group society which seemed to be becoming "two societies-separate and equal." They revealed, also, that there was only one (1) program designed specifically for disadvantaged learners, in the case for retarded readers who were entering junior high school, in the entire Chatham County-City of Savannah area, and one program in Black Studies being planned-by the Great Issues (Social Studies) Faculty of the Savannah State College Upward Bound Project. The consultations, then, reemphasized the need to provide experiences which would help teachers to understand their pupils better, and to meet the needs of both teachers and pupils for a better understanding of the role of Africa in the world society, and of Afro-Americans in American society. Additionally, the consultations, along with the examination of available resources, indicated the need to assemble a variety of materials, both to use with participant-teachers, and for participants to use in their work with high school pupils.

The consultations laid the groundwork for cooperation with college personnel and with local educational leaders both in subsequent planning and in the operation of the Institute. The principal of the only high school in the city which would have a summer program agreed to the use of the Social Studies classes for two separate laboratory experiences of one week's duration each for Institute participants. The Director of Savannah State's Upward Bound Project had consented to a similar arrangement while the original proposal was being drafted; and throughout the year

the Upward Bound Great Issues Coordinator served as unofficial consultant on problems of selection and evaluation of instructional materials.

With respect to the availability and distribution of resources for planning some minor problems were encountered in regard to the interrelated elements of time, staff, facilities, and funds. Since Savannah State is a rapidly growing small college, facilities, especially office space, are at a premium. Not a little time was spent just locating satisfactory office space, and arranging for needed furniture and equipment. In addition, the funds did not appear to be sufficient for purchasing the needed supplies and instructional materials (including books for both participants and pupils) and at the same time paying for released time for the Director. Consequently, the Director assisted by two Institute staff members, undertook to do the planning while carrying the normal college teaching load (15 quarter hours). With a slightly larger planning grant, should such be forthcoming, we would endeavor to secure the release of two-thirds time for one person or one-third time for two persons, so that the planning and supervising of office staff might proceed more smoothly. The experience in negotiating for office space should enable us to resolve that problem sooner and more satisfactorily on the second time around.

B. Participants

Both the extent of applicant responses and the qualifications of the applicants were slightly above our expectations. There were in the neighborhood of one thousand applications or expressions of interest in an Institute which was designed for a maximum of 30 participants. Most of the applicants, moreover, were pretty eminently qualified in terms of the extent to which they met the criteria for selection, and of their apparent

need for the kind of experiences which the Institute sought to provide. Although our selection criteria was not designed to achieve any specific mix, it was hoped that the crucial need in this area for the Institute's subject matter and approach, would have elicited a wider response from the non-black teachers in the Savannah area. It would appear that more personal contacts will be needed to secure this kind of result, and we have already taken some initial, though tentative, steps in that direction in preparation for next year. These steps include arrangements for earlier contacts with the City-County Social Studies Supervisor to enlist his support, and the possible addition of one of this year's participants to the Institute staff to work specifically in this area.

The number of participants (26) seemed to be about right, although a variation of from four to six in either direction (although preferably upward because of the need) would not have had any serious consequences for the Institute's effectiveness. The group was large enough to achieve desirable variations in attitudes and abilities, but small enough for congenial work and recreational relationships to develop. The demographic variation also contributed to a sharing of different perspectives by participants from large cities (Atlanta and Charleston) from growing cities like Savannah, and from small towns and rural areas from outstate Georgia primarily. In terms of the ages and years of teaching experience of the participants, the majority were young and relatively inexperienced, although there were enough "veterans" who brought with them the benefit of varied kinds of experiences to share with younger participants and staff. We feel, however, that this particular mix will increase the Institute's impact because younger teachers are more amenable to change, in addition

to having more years of service left to give to the profession. Differences in perspective, possibly broadening the spectrum, might have been achieved had there been more participants from outside the South. (There was only one - from Joliet, Illinois).

C. Staff

The staff of the Institute in African and Afro-American Cultures was both eminently qualified and dedicated. Each of the staff member had special training in the area in which he worked. In addition, each staff member had had prior teaching experiences with disadvantaged minority group children. And since one of the objectives of the Institute was to increase the participants knowledge of African and Afro-American cultures and to improve their competencies in selecting and adapting curricula materials to meet the needs of disadvantaged youth, therefore, the role of each instructor was both crucial and essential to the effectiveness of the Institute program.

Thus, the selection of the staff in regard to their training and skills was highly necessary.

Hence, Hanes Walton, Jr. was selected as the instructor for the course in the African Backgrounds of Negro American Culture.

Dr. Walton is Associate Professor of Political Science in the Division of Social Science at Savannah State College. He received his bachelor degree from Morehouse College in Political Science and Sociology, his Master of Arts from Atlanta University with a major in Political Science, and his doctorate from Howard University with a major in Government and a specialization in African Government. He has taught Political Science at Atlanta University and Savannah State College. He has published several articles

on the Negro in American Life and some on African Government. In acquiring a specialization in African Government, Dr. Walton took such courses as Traditional African Political Systems - which well prepared him to teach a course dealing with the use, development and decline of Ancient African Civilizations. Moreover, the nature and significance of each culture was well known by him - because his extensive research and publications in this area had further strengthen his insights. And finally - the impact of the slave trade upon these cultures had also been brought to his attention. And since the participants who took part in the institute, had little or no knowledge of early Africa (see the Appendix) - his insights and transmission of this knowledge was invaluable.

Twenty-four of the twenty-six felt that he was highly qualified, and very effective in getting over the subject matter.

In regard to his effectiveness in the program-test results indicate that it was highly significant. Results further showed that there was 20% increase in six weeks in their knowledge of African Cultures (see Appendix) and additional findings indicate that the attitude of the participants regarding Africa have changed significantly from a negative and neutral one to a much more positive one.

Mr. Delacy Sanford was selected as the instructor in the Negro in American History course. Delacy Sanford is an instructor in history at Savannah State College. He received the bachelors degree with a major in History from Savannah State College and the Master of Arts in American History and Negro History from Duquesne University, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. He holds a certificate in Urban Problems, with particular emphasis on the Negro, from Carnegie-Mellon University Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, where he spent a year studying Urban problems and their solutions. He has done

extensive research in Negro History and has several articles for current publication. In acquiring his degree in History and his certificate in Urban Affairs - Mr. Sanford gain tremendous insights into Black History. And his constant research in the area further increased his knowledge and competence.

Twenty-one of the twenty-six participants felt that he was highly qualified, while the same number felt that he was very effective. The test result collaborate the personal evaluation by the participants. There was a 21% increase in their knowledge in black history, and our attitude test revealed that the participants left with a much more favorable idea about Black people - than they had before hand.

Mr. Thomas H. Byers was selected for the course in Curriculum and Methodology Teaching The Culturally Disadvantaged.

Thomas H. Byers is Associate Professor of Social Science at Savannah State College; Mr. Byers expects to complete the requirements for the doctorate in Social Science Education from Ball State University between now and the time the proposed Institute is scheduled to begin. Professor Byers holds the A.B. degree from Johnson C. Smith University, and the Master of Arts in Political Science from the University of Michigan. He has taught social studies in the public schools, History and Political Science at the college level, and has taught Social Science Methods and supervised student teachers at Lincoln University and at Ball State University (as a Doctoray Fellow). In the summer of 1967 he served on the staff of an NDEA Civics Institute (For Teachers of the Disadvantaged) at Indiana University. Professor Byers taught the Curriculum Methods course and supervised the field testing experience.

In acquiring his professional training - Mr. Byers gain tremendous insight into social science education, i.e., teaching methodologies as well as curriculum development. In addition, the training that he received as a participant in one of the special media increased his competence in the methodology area.

In fact, eighteen of the twenty-six participants found him highly qualified and some fourteen felt that he was very effective. Field observations of their first and second teaching experiences - strongly indicated that the second teaching experiences and techniques were greatly improved and well balanced.

Miss Brenda D. Mobley was chosen as an assistant instructor in the Curriculum and Methods of Teaching the Culturally Disadvantaged course and as the Psychometrist.

Miss Mobley is an instructor in Education at Savannah State College. She received the bachelors degree with a major in Psychology from Fisk University, and the Master of Arts in Psychology from Tuskegee Institute. In addition to her teaching experience, she has also counselling experience with college students and with all age groups as a member of the staff of the Savannah Office of Economic Opportunity. Miss Mobley served as counselor and assisted Professor Byers in the Laboratory and Field Testing phases of the Curriculum and Methods courses.

In gaining competence in her area - Miss Mobley had become an excellent person to discuss curriculum innovation and adaptation - thoroughly impressed the participants. In fact, they learned much from her directions.

Twenty of the twenty-six participants felt that she was highly qualified and twenty-one of the participants in their personal evaluation

found her very effective. The data obtained from observing the second teaching experiences collaborated those personal evaluation. She was definitely effective in this manner.

In addition, in her role as psychometrist, she proved to be invaluable to the institute. As Assistant Director in charge of the Institute Testing Programs - she constructed both pre and post test to determine the actual effectiveness of the program in terms of goal achievements. In fact, it was from her test instruments and questionnaires, that we were able to evaluate the program in terms of its strenghts, weakness and success. Moreover, since there is no standardized test on Black History and African Histroy, her knowledge of Test construction proved essential. Moreover, when we sought the impact of this new material on the attitudes of the participants - Miss Mobley once again proved useful - because there are no uniform test available on attitude measurements. Her knowledge of the sematic differential device - has given us great insights into the therapeutic value of teaching Black History.

Consultants

In light of one of our objectives which was to increase the participants knowledge of African and Afro-American Cultures and to improve their competences in selecting and adapting currucular materials to meet the needs of disadvantaged youth - we selected visiting consultants who were very specialized people in this respective areas and who could supplement the work of the various instructors.

Moreover, since two factors - i.e., art and music were traceable cultural artifacts from the African to the Afro-American cultures - we especially needed some competent people to deal with these areas. In addition, the use of the library facilities we felt was crucial as well

as well as an overall understanding of Black History.

And furthermore, the special problems of disadvantaged students had to be presented and dealt with as well as some useful tool explained to the teachers that they could use in aiding their disadvantaged students.

In this light then, we chose the following people:

Mr. Andrew L. McLemore, Head Librarian at Savannah State College.

He related the use of library facilities as well as how to locate pertinent reference materials in regard to African and Afro-American History. In their personal evaluation, twenty participants found him well qualified and some eighteen find him very effective in meeting their needs in this area.

Mr. Wade Simmons, Principal Harris Reading Center. Mr. Simmons discussed one of the most primary problems of disadvantaged children, ie., reading. In addition - he conveyed techniques and theories as how to meet and correct them. His presentation was essential - because one couldn't improve the self-concept of Blacks with Black History - unless they could read it first. Nineteen of the participants found his presentation very effective and twenty-two found him highly qualified to deal with the problem.

Mr. Philip Hampton, Artist and Art teacher at Savannah State - was chosen to talk on the nature and significance of African and Afro-American art. And since art is one of the traceable cultural artifacts of Black's life - his presentation was essential. All of the participants found him well qualified, and all of them felt that he was very effective in meeting their needs.

Mr. Walter Allen, music coordinator for the public school system of Athens, Georgia - and part-time faculty instructor at the University of

Georgia - was chosen to discuss the nature and significance of African and Afro-American music because it too was one of the traceable features of Black life. Twenty-five of the participants found his presentation to be of essential, while the same number found him well qualified.

Dr. Samuel Dubois Cook - Associate Professor of Political Science at Duke University was chosen to discuss the overall nature of Black History. His writings and research on the philosophy of Black History has made him an expert in the field - and twenty-four of the participants found his presentation - highly useful and effective. A like number felt him to be highly qualified.

Attorney Chester A. Davenport - Legislative Assistant to Senator Cranston (D-Calif) - was chosen to discuss the legal services that were available to the culturally deprived. Twenty of the participants found him well qualified and the same number found him very effective in helping them gain knowledge on how to help their students.

In conclusion then - I feel that both the regular staff and visiting consultants had a tremendous impact on the success of the program. The test results show a sizable increase in the knowledge of African and Afro-American History. The summary of the field observation of the teaching experiences also show a positive improvement in the teaching techniques and methods of the participants. And there also seem to have been a tremendous change in the attitudes of the participants from negative and neutral ones to positive ones. This then leads one to conclude that the achievements and successes of the institute was due to its' staff. In other words, the effectiveness of the program was due in part to a competent skilled and highly specialized staff, both regular or visiting.

D. Orientation Program

Participant orientation began with an Ice-breaker Social on the evening of their arrival in Savannah. Participants and their spouses were able to meet with staff and with each other on an informal basis, and to exchange information about each others' backgrounds which relationships as the Institute progressed. This initial activity was followed up with a more formal session on the first day of Institute classes. At this session the staff was formally introduced with a brief discussion being given of the specific educational and professional qualifications of each faculty member in terms of their relationship to the specific contribution which he (or she) was expected to make to the Institute's program. Each regular faculty member then briefly explained the objectives and nature of the course and/or other activity for which she was responsible.

Special activities, designed to establish a continuing dialogue between and among participants and staff, were conducted throughout the duration of the Institute. Usually these took the form of evaluative and planning session held during one of the regularly scheduled class periods. At these sessions, participants and staff evaluated previous activities and decided, on the basis of the evaluations, whether the activity, or similar ones should be continued, modified or eliminated. Except in cases where it was felt that previous commitments were binding, the decisions taken at such sessions were followed. Participants decided, for example, that instead of the Librarian's making a second scheduled class appearance, that the session would be conducted in the Library itself. Participants agreed that the scheduled trip to the Reading Center would be more beneficial to them than would a second lecture by the Director of the Center. Other decisions, affecting specific classes, were also made as a result of

participant-instructor consultations.

E. Program Operation

If the extent to which the specific program objectives were met is measured in terms of observed participant behavior, then two of the objectives were met to a great extent, while the third was met to a somewhat lesser extent. The behavior used as a criterion in evaluating the first objective-strengthened background in African and Afro-American Cultures - was performance on pre and post-tests which all participants were given. Gains in this area were registered by all of the participants. As the more extensive report in Section F (below) will reveal, these gains ranged from significant to impressive. The second objective - increases understanding of the environmental factors which affect the educational performance of disadvantaged youth - was evaluated subjectively in terms of contributions to class discussions, and in part objectively through a content analysis of units which participants brought with them as contrasted with those which developed during the course of the Institute's program. Again, the improvement ranged from significant to impressive. The third objective utilizing African and Afro-American topics to develop instructional units which would speak to the needs of disadvantaged youth - was achieved to a lesser degree than were the other two. However, given the obstacles which participants had to overcome, the limited success in this area was all that could be expected. Two of these obstacles, neither of which was entirely attributal to the participants themselves, are worthy of brief mention at this point.

The first obstacle was the requirement that the participants who worked with the Upward Bound Classes focus upon some minority group or groups other than the Negro, and then compare the experiences of the different

minorities. This requirement was established by the Instructor as the surest way to avoid duplicating work previously taken up or planned by the regular Upward Bound Instructor, since the class were already studying The Negro In America. Participants experienced some difficulty in finding enough materials dealing with other minorities, while the brief time span (These classes met 3 days per week) precluded effective development of comparisons.

The second obstacle was placed in the paths of the participants who worked with the local high school classes. That obstacle was the thinly disguised opposition of the teachers and parents to the teaching of black history to white children (and a few black children) by black teachers. (Participants were allowed to choose between the high school and the college's Upward Bound Project, and only one of the Caucasian participants chose the high school). The teachers openly challenged the accuracy of the information being presented, and in other ways interfered with the participants performance in the classroom. In addition, participants were unable to use the school's audio-visual equipment because it was being repaired during the summer months. Finally, the parents brought so much pressure to bear on the school superintendent and principal that the principal unilaterally terminated the laboratory experience after three days of a projected ten day activity. As a result of this termination, these participants had to be combined with those who were working with the Upward Bound classes for the second week of the laboratory experience.

In spite of the above obstacles, however, some interesting and innovative classroom procedures were tried out rather successfully by quite a few of the participants. They were attempting to utilize the "New Social Studies"

approaches developed by Fenton⁺, and there were interesting adaptations of some of these approaches to the study of minority groups and of the differential impact of prejudice and discrimination upon these groups. Participants made good use of films, filmstrips, tape recorders, and especially the overhead projector in teaching their classes. They almost made use of the newest duplicating materials and equipment, some provided by the college and some independently by the Institute, in developing and/or duplicating instructional materials. Use of the overhead projector and of duplicated handouts seemed to be more effective in stimulating active pupil involvement than any of the other devices used. In addition, there were several very effective learning situations created by use of the blackboard both to communicate broad ideas and to pose questions for pupil reaction.

The informal program, which included field trips and social activities, made both direct and indirect contributions to the effectiveness of the Institute. The field trips made a direct contribution by giving participants an on-the-spot look at some of the deplorable conditions under which poor Negroes and other disadvantaged persons live and by providing opportunities to view some of the historic places associated with American history in general, as well as with Afro-American history. Indirectly, the field trips contributed to the Institute's effectiveness by increasing the number of occasions for participants and faculty to become better acquainted and better informed about each other. This was also true of the social gatherings which afforded participants and faculty some of the kind of relaxation which revitalizes one for future efforts. In addition, the social activities gave faculty and participants a chance to get to know each other on an informal, individual basis, thus helping each to understand the other better.

⁺Edwin Fenton, Teaching The New Social Studies (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.)

The Institute's faculty including the Director and participants all felt that the Institute did not last long enough for optimum achievement of the goals which it had established. The beginning date was satisfactory because it corresponded with the beginning date for the summer program of the college. Extending the ending date about two weeks would have given faculty and participants more time for planning and joint evaluation of experiences, and participants more time for study and reflection, as well as for constructed activities. [The need for such additional time became more apparent as the Institute progressed.]. In all probability, a longer time period would make its most significant contribution to the effectiveness of the laboratory experience. [Since this was the area in which lack of sufficient time for planning was felt most keenly]. Overall, the same basic program extending over eight weeks instead of six, should enable faculty and participants to do a much better job, and to enjoy it more.

A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF THE INSTITUTE IN AFRICAN AND AFRO-AMERICAN CULTURE

Black children experience constantly damaging discrimination and prejudices which impede their psychological development and render impossible the formation of sound personality structure. The impact of his experiences is seen in every aspect of his behavior and especially in the social-learning situation. It cannot be denied that our nation faces a crucial problem--the necessity of securing greater understanding and harmony between the races. Vital to the solution of this problem is an awareness among both non-Blacks and Blacks of the importance of mutual understanding, respect, cooperation, and interaction. Primary to this however, is the essentiality of the enhancement of the self-concepts of Black children.

A particularly advantageous position for contributing to the formation of positive-self-concepts among Black children is that of teacher. Those teachers with sociological and psychological perceptiveness into the impact of socio-economic and cultural deprivation upon self-concept and level of educational attainment, manipulate in the relationship between teacher and environmental expectations and pupil attainment in such a manner as to bring about the desired personal enhancement.

The Institute in African and Afro-American Culture was designed to attain many goals--educational, social, and psychological in nature. An awareness of the problems confronting Black children in the construction of positive self-concepts, and the problems facing teachers, many of whom are vastly lacking in preparation for, the mutual function they have in this aspect of

development, were the basis of those goals. Cognizance of the role of the teacher in forming self-concept resulted in the two major objectives or goals upon which the present study focuses: a) an increase in the Institute participants' knowledge and understanding of Black history and culture, and b) concomitant favorable modification of their concepts of Black people and their conditions and behavior.

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects for the study were the participants in the EPDA Institute in African and Afro-American Culture¹ at Savannah State College, and students from the Upward Bound Program at the college and those enrolled in a local public summer school program. The Institute participants were 9 men and 17 women, while there were 41 male students and 53 female students. The main focus was upon participants in the Institute, with the students having been the group used in the practicum phase of the methodology course taught as a part of the Institute's program. The participants represented schools in six states and cities (see Table 2) with populations ranging from 250,000 to less than 2,500. Most of them taught social studies classes in public schools, grades 7-12, with Black student populations of over 75 per cent.² The students were in the eleventh and twelfth grades and were from 15 to 18 years old.

Instruments

Increase in knowledge and understanding of Black history was assessed using an objective Black History Test. Due to the lack of a comprehensive

¹

The Institute was sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Education Professions Development Act.

²See Table 1 for further description of the participants.

standardized instrument of this nature, the Black History Test was developed from tests used in Black History courses taught at the college over the past few years. Item-analysis and other evaluative findings indicated that the test is a reasonably valid measure of knowledge and understanding of Black History.

The Semantic Differential, an instrument developed by Osgood (1957),³ was used to evaluate modifications of concepts of Black people, their conditions, and behavior. This instrument assumes that measurement of the important components of a concept can be made by securing ratings of the concept on a number of bipolar adjectives, and from such ratings a semantic space can be defined in which the meaning of a concept can be specified. Specifically it attempts to measure the connotative meaning of a concept on one or more of these bipolar scales. Further assuming that connotative meaning is multi-dimensional, and that the concepts we commonly develop are heavily weighted by three factors, factor-analysis has yielded three scales on the semantic differential representing the major dimensions of meaning. The instrument's major use is that of measuring changes in connotative or implied meaning.

Procedure

The Black History Test was introduced to the Institute participants as a diagnostic measure of their knowledge of Black history and culture during the orientation period, which was the first day of the Institute. Information about performance was given only in a general manner. The Black History Test was re-administered six weeks later on the last day of classes of the

³ Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, Percy H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

Institute to provide the retest measure and that of differences in responses. The tests were scored and evaluated in the same manner on both occasions.

The Semantic Differential⁴ was also administered to the participants on the first and last days of the Institute. Here again the purpose was to attain measures of pre-Institute responses for comparison with post-Institute responses. The differences in performance comprised the measure of modification or change. Thirteen concepts were included in the instrument, with 18 scales forming the bases for judgement. Among the thirteen concepts were concepts directly related to the subject matter, as well as others which bore some other direct or indirect relationship to the concept of Blackness.

The students made semantic judgements of four concepts on 18 scales. The Semantic Differential was administered to them prior to being taught by the participants and after one week of classes with the participants as teachers. As with the assessment of participants the differences in responses formed the measure of modification.

All responses were totaled and the data analyzed in the following manner. The Black History scores were evaluated as to changes in actual scores and individual rank. Mean scores, standard deviations, Rho correlations, and a test of significance of difference between the means of the two tests were computed. The raw data obtained with the semantic differential were a series of seven scores indicating the positions, or semantic spaces, on the 18 scales, and designated the digits 1-7. To

⁴For further information about the semantic differential, semantic theory, and practice, see Charles E. Osgood, "The Nature and Measurement of Meaning," Psychological Bulletin (Vol. 49, 1962), C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards, The Meaning of Meaning, (rev. ed.), (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc., 1947) and John B. Carroll (ed.), Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1962).

maintain scoring consistency, the favorable poles of the three factor scales (evaluative, potency, and activity) have been assigned the score of "7" and the unfavorable poles the score of "1", with the score "4" being neutral. Thus, the scores were interpreted in the following manner: 7= extremely favorable, 6= very favorable, 5= favorable, 3= unfavorable, 2=very unfavorable, and 1= extremely unfavorable. Although the evaluative scale yields the more valid attitude score, the potency and activity scales are used to provide, aside from attitude toward a concept, information on the concept as a whole. The potency factor is concerned with power and the things associated with it, such as size, weight and toughness. The activity factor is concerned with dynamism--quickness, agitation, excitement and warmth. Semantic differential responses were analyzed for mean group scores for all scales of each concept. Differences in allocation, i.e. difference in meaning as measured shift in change in semantic space of concepts were computed, yielding measures of differences in pre- and post-Institute responses. Analysis was also made of the direction and magnitude of change in concepts, and the differences in meaning of the concepts "Negro" and "African."

Results

Tables 1 and 2 give a description of the participants, their sex, ages, education, teaching experience, and the geographical locations where they are employed. Did these teachers indeed increase their knowledge and understanding of Black history and culture? The results shown in Table 3 give an overwhelming affirmation that they did. All of the changes in performance based on the comparison of test and retest scores were positive. The average increase in scores was 20 points, with a range in

scores of 2 to 51 points. Further, analysis of the difference between the means of the two sets of test scores was highly significant ($p .001$), indicating that the probability of such a change occurring by chance alone was less than one in one hundred. Correlation between the two sets of scores was very low ($r=.27$), exhibiting a limited relationship between the performance of the participants on this test before the Institute as compared with their performance on the same measure after the Institute. Clearly, the increases in performance were based on the assimilation of information transmitted during the course of the Institute, rather than any previous knowledge of the subject. The objective of increasing knowledge and understanding of Black history was attained substantially.

Inspection of Tables 4-16 show a definite contrast in the mean ratings and differences in allocation of the concepts rated on the semantic differential. These tables give the results of pre- and post-Institute ratings, by participants, reflecting changes over a five-week period. The difference in allocation measure was based on the mean group ratings of the concepts, using a generalized distance formula which assessed the linear distance between the points in the semantic spaces represented by pre- and post-Institute ratings. A graphic representation of these changes can be found in Figures

The concepts "Poverty," "Cultural Deprivation," and "the Disadvantaged" (Tables 4-7) were rated unfavorable on the evaluative scales. Most intense was the attitude that they are bad, unattractive, tense, and unpleasant. On the potency scale they were generally designated as being tough, difficult and impotent. However, the activity factor illustrates that the participants view them as dynamic forces.

Favorable evaluative ratings were assigned to the concepts "Black Self-Concept", "Negro", "Black Power", and "African", Tables 7, 8, 15 and 16. These concepts received significant ratings of "good", "valuable", and "wise", while also being attractive, and pleasant. Ratings of these three concepts on the potency scale attributed strength to all of them, with the most "rugged" being the concept of "Black Power." Activity-factor ratings indicated that all three of the concepts are dynamic, and "sharp," the concept "African" being rated highest of this factor. A decided difference in concepts on this scale exists, however, in that the concept "Black Power" is rated as being tense as opposed to the others.

The most extreme unfavorable evaluative ratings were assigned to the concept "Racism." This unfavorable attitude toward "Racism" increased in intensity during the program, being rated as extremely "bad", "unpleasant", "tense", "cruel" and "ignorant" at the close of the program. It was designated an intractable concept, very "active" and "tense". Also judged unfavorable on the evaluative scale were the concepts "Separatism" and "The Establishment." However, ratings of this concept on the potency and activity scales were approaching neutrality. Further, "Separatism" was judged as being "tense" and "sick."

The concepts "Revolution" and "Welfare" generally received neutral ratings by the participants. "Revolution" was rated, however, "tense" and "unpleasant" on the evaluative scale, as well as on the activity scale.

Comparison of the mean semantic judgements of participants according to ethnic membership (Tables 18-30) of the thirteen concepts shows some significant and interesting differences. The concepts on which these two groups differed most in their ratings were those of "Revolution," "Separatism,"

and "Racism." There was, however, a general decline in the amount of difference at the close of the Institute. The greatest similarity or agreement was between the concepts "Black Power," "The Disadvantaged," and "Poverty" before the Institute, and "Black Self-Concept," and "Poverty" after the Institute. The concept "African" was rated practically the same by both groups both pre- and post-Institute.

Evaluation of changes in concept on the semantic differential must be made on a relative basis. Thus, the changes in one concept must be compared to those in another. Without question, in the present study the most favorable change, among participants, was in the concept of "African." (Table 17) This concept underwent a positive change on all three scales--the only concept showing the same direction of change throughout. Substantial favorable changes on the evaluative scale occurred for the concepts "Separatism," "Revolution," and "Establishment." And though the changes that took place were not of the magnitude to alter the unfavorable attitudes toward these concepts, there does appear to be a decrease in the intensity of the negative feelings toward them. The increase in unfavorable ratings among the other concepts were minimal in comparison to the positive changes described above.

Table 31 shows changes from pre- to post-Institute in semantic differential judgments for participants in terms of ethnic membership. Here we find the greater favorable changes on the evaluative scale were made for the concepts "Separatism," "Militance", "Revolution" and "African" for both groups. Other favorable changes were shown in the concepts "Black Self-Concept", "Poverty," "The Disadvantaged," and "Black Power" for the Black participants; and "Cultural Deprivation," "Negro," "Racism" and "Welfare"

for the non-Black group. The information in these two tables indicate that the Institute has had some effect in the modification of the attitudes of the participants. The extent of this modification, and its consequent effect on their future behavior cannot be measured at this time.

Tables 32-35 give the results of semantic differential judgements of the 94 students taught by the participants. The students rated four concepts on 18 scales. Analysis shows minimal changes in the ratings of these concepts in the course of a week. They assigned favorable evaluative ratings to the concepts "Negro" and "African." They received favorable ratings on all scales. "Poverty" and "Racism" received unfavorable ratings. The students found "Poverty" "bad" and "unpleasant," while "Racism" is "tense."

Pre- and post-teaching changes in semantic differential judgements for these students were in a negative direction. The greatest changes were for the concepts "Racism" and "African," though there was no significant change in semantic space.

For the purpose of measuring the participants and students attitudes towards the concepts "Negro" and "African," the information in Tables 37-40 was compiled. With a nation-wide controversy raging over what Black people should be called, we sought to measure the relative merit or attractiveness of these two concepts for our subjects. The results show that while the differences here are also minimal, there appears to be some preference for the term "Negro" as attested by the higher favorable rating.

Discussion

These findings indicate that the Institute in African and Afro-American Culture was extensively successful in increasing its participants knowledge

and understanding of black history as measured by the Black History Test. The increases in performance and statistical significance of such can be readily attributed to their experiences during the Institute's program. These findings indicate the relative merit in teaching such courses, possibly in part, because of the readiness and ease with which this information is absorbed.

The results of the semantic differential judgements, though not entirely conclusive, further illustrate that attitudes can indeed be modified through the incorporation of new facts and ideas. Favorable changes in attitudes toward concepts such as "Black Self-Concept", "Poverty", "The Disadvantaged", "Negro", and "Welfare" should have some meaningful impact on the future performance of these teachers. When their occupation requires that they impart knowledge and ideals to students who are black, in the process of forming self-concepts, disadvantaged due to poverty and being assisted through welfare, favorable attitudes toward these concepts are a necessity.

Words and their implied meanings, function very significantly in an individual's behavior. In fact, they can theoretically change one's whole environmental perception. As a measure of attitude, the semantic differential has proven to be highly reliable, and has displayed reasonable face validity. And, while it does not offer extremely detailed information about the structure of attitudes, it has proven to be a very good standard instrument for the measurement of attitudes.

The increase in knowledge of black history and culture appears to have had a very direct impact upon the attitudes of the participants toward those concepts related to the information taught. That attitudes are a result of varied types of learning is an accepted fact, and changes of the magnitude and in the directions observed in the present study further corroborate this fact.

Hindered by the lack of standardized measuring instruments for the analysis of the factors investigated, and a very short period of duration, the present

study has of necessity been innovative. And, while many may question the validity of the data and conclusions obtained, until a more adequate, more discerning methods are devised, those used herein might be a point of departure. This study was carried out, not to prove the relative merit of black studies in the modification of attitudes, but to determine whether or not such merit exists. The results gathered herein show that it does. It is hoped that in the very near future another institute of this type can be conducted, and that at that time there will be adequate instruments to evaluate its impact, and that they be compared with the findings of the present study. In the meantime, efforts are being made by the staff of the EPDA Institute in African and Afro-American Culture to devise such instruments and extend their study to the effect of the Institute experience upon the future performance of its subjects or participants.

The limitations of the design and execution of the present study do not cancel out the conclusions drawn. Black history and culture is a legitimate area of study - one which evokes extensive interest and involvement. Black studies are further capable of bringing about changes in the attitudes of not only non-blacks, but also blacks, towards blacks and things black. Heightened understanding of a group of people also fosters compassion for the group - compassion which most certainly be reciprocated. An understanding of black history and culture further affords one insight into the nature and causes of racial problems - an understanding which is prerequisite to racial harmony. The experience of the participants in the EPDA Institute in African and Afro-American Culture was not a totally unique one. However, the data gathered after only five weeks is significant, and has positive implications for the role of black studies in the future.

TABLE 1

DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS (N=26)

Variable	N	%
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	9	35
Female	17	65
<u>Age (average)</u>		
Male	34	
Female	30	
<u>Education</u>		
Bachelor's degree	24	92
Master's degree	2	8
<u>Teaching Experience</u>		
1-4 years	13	50
5-9 years	6	23
10-14 years	2	8
15-19 years	1	4
20 years or more	4	16

TABLE 2

PARTICIPANT PERFORMANCE ON BLACK HISTORY TEST

Subject	<u>Test</u>		<u>Retest</u>		Increase in Score
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	
1	56	7	67	15	11
2	39	20.5	56	25.5	17
3	52	12	59	21.5	7
4	43	19	94	1	51
5	45	18	72	9	27
6	53	9.5	60	20	7
7	37	24.5	68	13	31
8	29	26	59	21.5	30
9	50	14	80	6	30
10	58	6	65	16	7
11	54	8	64	17.5	10
12	37	24.5	71	10	34
13	53	9.5	68	13	15
14	38	22.5	69	11	31
15	77	2	89	3	12
16	83	1	85	5	2
17	39	20.5	57	23.5	18
18	59	5	68	13	9
19	48	16	57	23.5	9
20	52	12	56	25.5	4
21	64	3	73	8	9
22	38	22.5	61	19	23
23	62	4	92	2	30
24	48	16	64	17.5	16
25	48	16	88	4	40
26	52	12	76	7	24
	<u>Test</u>		<u>Retest</u>		
Mean	50		70		
Standard Deviation	8.48		15		

$p < .001$ $\Gamma = .27$

TABLE 3

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS

State/City	No. Participants
<u>Alabama</u>	
Dothan	1
Enterprise	1
<u>Arkansas</u>	
West Helena	1
<u>Georgia</u>	
Athens	1
Camilla	1
Claxton	1
Milledgeville	1
Monroe	1
Ringgold	1
Savannah	10
Sparta	1
<u>Illinois</u>	
Joliet	1
<u>Mississippi</u>	
Tupelo	1
<u>South Carolina</u>	
Beaufort	1
Charleston	1
Conway	1
Frogmore	1

TABLE 4

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT
 "POVERTY" AS RATED PRE-AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE
 SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL BY PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	2.03	1.42	
Beautiful-Ugly	1.92	1.69	
Intelligent-Ignorant	2.35	2.54	
Kind-Cruel	2.19	2.03	
Relaxed-Tense	1.92	1.85	
Valuable-Worthless	3.07	2.31	
Wise-Foolish	2.73	2.31	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	1.69	1.85	
Total Scale	2.24	2.00	.113
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.92	5.53	
Hard-Soft	5.64	5.81	
Heavy-Light	5.31	5.38	
Rugged-Delicate	5.11	5.81	
Deep-Shallow	5.38	5.64	
Strong-Weak	2.92	3.62	
Healthy-Sick	2.35	1.85	
Total Scale	4.52	4.78	.120
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	1.92	1.85	
Sharp-Dull	3.23	4.12	
Active-Passive	3.35	5.56	
Fast-Slow	3.47	4.19	
Total Scale	3.00	3.68	.133

TABLE 5

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT CULTURAL DEPRIVATION AS RATED PRE-AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL BY PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute	Post-Institute	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	1.58	1.50	
Beautiful-Ugly	2.04	2.84	
Intelligent-Ignorant	2.42	2.54	
Kind-Cruel	2.19	2.12	
Relaxed-Tense	2.84	2.15	
Valuable-Worthless	2.80	2.00	
Wise-Foolish	2.62	2.43	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.00	1.69	
Total Scale	2.31	2.16	.138
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.65	4.65	
Hard-Soft	5.15	5.35	
Heavy-Light	4.88	4.73	
Rugged-Delicate	5.08	5.12	
Strong-Weak	3.08	3.62	
Healthy-Sick	2.50	2.35	
Total Scale	4.37	4.41	
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	2.85	2.15	
Sharp-Dull	3.77	3.65	
Active-Passive	4.00	4.42	
Fast-Slow	3.77	4.04	
Total Scale	3.59	3.57	.097

TABLE 6

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "THE DISADVANTAGED" AS RATED PRE-AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL BY PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	2.04	1.65	
Beautiful-Ugly	1.96	2.46	
Intelligent-Ignorant	2.42	2.88	
Kind-Cruel	2.38	2.65	
Relaxed-Tense	2.312	2.23	
Valuable-Worthless	3.50	2.69	
Wise-Foolish	3.27	2.73	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.08	2.50	
Total Scale	2.50	2.48	.135
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	5.27	4.81	
Hard-Soft	5.19	5.04	
Heavy-Light	4.69	5.08	
Rugged-Delicate	4.31	5.46	
Deep-Shallow	5.08	4.88	
Strong-Weak	3.19	3.12	
Healthy-Sick	3.12	2.81	
Total Scale	4.41	4.46	.095
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	2.31	2.23	
Sharp-Dull	3.19	4.08	
Active-Passive	3.73	4.15	
Fast-Slow	3.19	3.65	
Total Scale	3.11	3.53	1.090

TABLE 7

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "BLACK SELF-CONCEPT" AS RATED PRE-AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL BY PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	6.58	5.81	
Beautiful-Ugly	6.46	5.81	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.62	5.77	
Kind-Cruel	4.81	5.27	
Relaxed-Tense	5.35	4.96	
Valuable-Worthless	6.53	6.31	
Wise-Foolish	5.69	6.08	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.62	5.46	
Total Scale	5.84	5.65	.139
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.46	5.00	
Hard-Soft	5.35	4.27	
Heavy-Light	4.46	4.23	
Rugged-Delicate	4.19	4.04	
Deep-Shallow	5.12	5.35	
Strong-Weak	6.08	5.27	
Healthy-Sick	5.73	5.73	
Total Scale	5.05	4.84	.104
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	5.35	4.69	
Sharp-Dull	4.81	5.15	
Active-Passive	5.69	5.65	
Fast-Slow	4.54	5.04	
Total Scale	5.10	5.13	.039

TABLE 8

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "NEGRO"
AS RATED PRE-AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
BY PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	6.15	6.12	
Beautiful-Ugly	6.15	5.96	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.88	6.12	
Kind-Cruel	5.23	5.14	
Relaxed-Tense	4.04	4.23	
Valuable-Worthless	6.58	5.81	
Wise-Foolish	5.73	5.46	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.85	5.00	
Total Scale	5.70	5.48	.116
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.38	4.81	
Hard-Soft	4.38	4.31	
Heavy-Light	4.69	4.35	
Rugged-Delicate	4.81	4.77	
Deep-Shallow	4.58	4.96	
Strong-Weak	5.65	5.54	
Healthy-Sick	5.08	5.31	
Total Scale	4.80	4.25	.072
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	4.04	4.23	
Sharp-Dull	4.96	4.58	
Active-Passive	5.35	5.42	
Fast-Slow	4.38	4.58	
Total Scale	4.68	4.70	.067

TABLE 9

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "RACISM"
AS RATED PRE-AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	2.04	1.62	
Beautiful-Ugly	2.15	1.81	
Intelligent-Ignorant	2.42	2.04	
Kind-Cruel	1.88	1.69	
Relaxed-Tense	1.69	1.69	
Valuable-Worthless	2.42	2.15	
Wise-Foolish	2.08	2.08	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	1.73	1.69	
Total Scale	2.05	1.85	.074
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.69	5.58	
Hard-Soft	5.19	5.50	
Heavy-Light	4.96	5.35	
Rugged-Delicate	4.73	5.38	
Deep-Shallow	4.81	4.77	
Strong-Weak	4.27	3.12	
Healthy-Sick	2.42	2.23	
Total Scale	4.44	4.42	.167
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	1.69	1.69	
Sharp-Dull	4.46	4.73	
Active-Passive	5.23	6.08	
Fast-Slow	4.00	4.77	
Total Scale	3.85	4.32	.117

TABLE 10

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "SEPARATISM"
AS RATED PRE- AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	2.35	2.77	
Beautiful-Ugly	2.27	3.50	
Intelligent-Ignorant	2.85	3.62	
Kind-Cruel	2.65	3.19	
Relaxed-Tense	2.58	3.04	
Valuable-Worthless	2.81	3.62	
Wise-Foolish	2.54	3.54	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.50	2.73	
Total Scale	2.57	3.32	.185
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	3.85	4.08	
Hard-Soft	4.54	4.62	
Heavy-Light	4.00	4.46	
Rugged-Delicate	4.12	4.77	
Deep-Shallow	4.04	3.85	
Strong-weak	3.50	3.77	
Healthy-Sick	2.35	3.62	
Total Scale	3.84	4.16	.118
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	2.58	3.04	
Sharp-Dull	4.23	4.19	
Active-Passive	4.73	4.85	
Fast-Slow	4.23	3.46	
Total Scale	3.94	3.88	.005

TABLE 11

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "MILITANCE"
AS RATED PRE- AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	3.42	4.65	
Beautiful-Ugly	3.55	4.50	
Intelligent-Ignorant	4.42	4.58	
Kind-Cruel	3.42	3.35	
Relaxed-Tense	2.31	3.04	
Valuable-Worthless	4.27	5.27	
Wise-Foolish	4.31	4.81	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	3.19	3.77	
Total Scale	3.61	4.24	.176
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	3.96	4.59	
Hard-Soft	5.15	5.23	
Heavy-Light	4.88	4.50	
Rugged-Delicate	5.12	5.15	
Deep-Shallow	4.62	4.50	
Strong-Weak	5.42	4.96	
Healthy-Sick	4.04	4.81	
Total Scale	4.74	4.82	.120
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	2.31	3.04	
Sharp-Dull	4.92	4.58	
Active-Passive	6.04	5.23	
Fast-Slow	4.85	4.96	
Total Scale	4.53	4.45	.115

TABLE 12

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "REVOLUTION" AS RATED PRE- AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	4.54	4.50	
Beautiful-Ugly	3.15	3.69	
Intelligent-Ignorant	4.81	5.46	
Kind-Cruel	3.92	3.73	
Relaxed-Tense	2.19	2.77	
Valuable-Worthless	5.31	5.35	
Wise-Foolish	5.19	4.62	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.88	3.15	
Total Scale	4.01	4.16	.122
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.12	4.38	
Hard-Soft	5.46	5.12	
Heavy-Light	4.88	4.96	
Rugged-Delicate	5.27	5.73	
Deep-Shallow	4.88	3.81	
Strong-Weak	5.35	4.62	
Healthy-Sick	4.50	4.31	
Total Scale	4.92	4.70	.146
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	2.19	2.77	
Sharp-Dull	5.08	5.12	
Active-Passive	5.65	5.69	
Fast-Slow	4.54	5.15	
Total Scale	4.36	4.68	.007

TABLE 13

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "WELFARE" AS RATED PRE- AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	4.46	3.69	
Beautiful-Ugly	3.58	3.38	
Intelligent-Ignorant	4.19	4.12	
Kind-Cruel	3.69	3.82	
Relaxed-Tense	3.38	3.31	
Valuable-Worthless	5.38	5.04	
Wise-Foolish	5.42	5.12	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	3.92	3.65	
Total Scale	4.25	4.02	.114
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.65	5.04	
Hard-Soft	4.23	4.50	
Heavy-Light	4.15	4.61	
Rugged-Delicate	4.12	4.54	
Deep-Shallow	4.73	4.54	
Strong-Weak	4.16	3.73	
Healthy-Sick	4.46	4.65	
Total Scale	4.36	4.49	.009
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	3.38	3.31	
Sharp-Dull	4.77	4.04	
Active-Passive	4.62	4.31	
Fast-Slow	3.61	4.65	
Total Scale	4.14	4.08	.116

TABLE 14

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "THE ESTABLISHMENT"
AS RATED PRE- AND POST-INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
BY PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	3.73	2.85	
Beautiful-Ugly	3.42	3.65	
Intelligent-Ignorant	4.58	3.81	
Kind-Cruel	3.27	2.88	
Relaxed-Tense	3.26	3.19	
Valuable-Worthless	4.77	3.81	
Wise-Foolish	4.23	3.92	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	3.50	3.31	
Total Scale	3.84	3.30	.185
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.96	4.76	
Hard-Soft	4.81	4.58	
Heavy-Light	4.54	4.73	
Rugged-Delicate	4.65	4.77	
Deep-Shallow	4.19	4.08	
Strong-Weak	4.77	4.62	
Healthy-Sick	4.19	3.46	
Total Scale	4.48	4.43	.118
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	3.26	3.19	
Sharp-Dull	4.84	4.58	
Active-Passive	5.12	5.34	
Fast-Slow	4.15	4.04	
Total Scale	4.34	4.34	.005

TABLE 15

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATIONS (D) OF THE CONCEPT "BLACK POWER" AS RATED PRE- AND POST- INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluation</u>			
Good-Bad	5.04	5.19	
Beautiful-Ugly	5.35	4.85	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.27	5.19	
Kind-Cruel	4.54	4.23	
Relaxed-Tense	3.35	3.92	
Valuable-Worthless	6.08	5.81	
Wise-Foolish	5.54	5.81	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.38	5.00	
Total Scale	5.07	5.00	.099
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.62	4.62	
Hard-Soft	4.58	4.85	
Heavy-Light	4.46	4.50	
Rugged-Delicate	5.12	4.27	
Deep-Shallow	4.85	4.96	
Strong-Weak	5.69	5.65	
Healthy-Sick	5.08	5.19	
Total Scale	4.91	4.86	.011
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	3.35	3.92	
Sharp-Dull	5.23	5.35	
Active-Passive	5.88	5.65	
Fast-Slow	4.88	4.92	
Total Scale	4.84	4.96	.062

TABLE 16

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "AFRICAN" AS RATED PRE- AND POST- INSTITUTE ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL BY THE PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Pre-Institute M	Post-Institute M	D
<u>Evaluation</u>			
Good-Bad	5.42	6.23	
Beautiful-Ugly	5.88	5.85	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.96	6.27	
Kind-Cruel	4.96	5.08	
Relaxed-Tense	4.12	4.54	
Valuable-Worthless	6.00	6.04	
Wise-Foolish	5.54	5.69	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.35	5.88	
Total Scale	5.40	5.70	.112
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	5.08	5.38	
Hard-Soft	4.58	4.54	
Heavy-Light	4.15	4.54	
Rugged-Delicate	5.65	5.08	
Deep-Shallow	4.96	5.12	
Strong-Weak	5.38	5.62	
Healthy-Sick	5.38	5.73	
Total Scale	5.03	5.16	.009
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	4.12	4.54	
Sharp-Dull	5.15	4.96	
Active-Passive	5.04	5.77	
Fast-Slow	4.54	4.96	
Total Score	4.71	5.06	.124

TABLE 17

Changes from Pre-Institute to Post-Institute in Semantic Differential Judgements for Participants in the EPDA Institute in African and Afro-American Culture

(The sign represents the direction of change and the value represents the magnitude of the change)

Concept	Evaluation	Potency	Changes On
			Activity
Poverty	-(.24)	+(.26)	+(.68)
Cultural Deprivation	-(.15)	+(.04)	-(.02)
Disadvantaged	-(.02)	+(.05)	+(.42)
Black Self-Concept	-(.19)	-(.21)	+(.03)
Negro	-(.22)	-(.55)	+(.02)
Racism	-(.20)	-(.02)	+(.47)
Separatism	+(.75)	+(.32)	-(.06)
Militance	+(.63)	+(.08)	-(.08)
Revolution	+(.15)	-(.22)	-(.32)
Welfare	-(.23)	+(.13)	-(.06)
Establishment	+(.54)	+(1.95)	None
Black Power	-(.07)	-(.05)	+(.12)
African	+(.30)	+(.13)	+(.35)

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT POVERTY ACCORDING TO ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	2.23	1.00		1.45	1.25	
Beautiful-Ugly	2.05	1.25		5.27	1.25	
Intelligent-Ignorant	2.32	2.75		2.45	3.00	
Kind-Cruel	2.23	1.50		2.05	1.25	
Relaxed-Tense	1.91	2.00		1.95	1.25	
Valuable-Worthless	3.00	3.50		2.27	2.50	
Wise-Foolish	2.72	2.75		2.32	2.25	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	1.77	1.25		2.00	2.00	
Total Scale	2.28	2.00	.28	2.47	1.84	.63
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	5.14	3.75		6.32	1.25	
Hard-Soft	5.95	4.00		5.82	5.75	
Heavy-Light	5.23	5.75		5.27	6.00	
Rugged-Delicate	5.27	4.75		5.77	6.25	
Deep-Shallow	5.46	5.00		5.64	5.50	
Strong-Weak	3.09	2.00		3.77	2.75	
Healthu-Sick	2.64	3.75		2.00	1.25	
Total Scale	4.18	3.75	.93	4.94	4.11	.83
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	1.91	2.00		1.96	1.25	
Sharp-Dull	3.18	3.50		4.09	4.25	
Active-Passive	3.91	2.25		4.68	4.00	
Fast-Slow	3.50	2.75		4.32	3.50	
Total Scale	3.13	2.63	.50	3.76	3.25	.51

TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT CULTURAL DEPRIVATION ACCORDING TO ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	1.64	1.25		1.55	1.25	
Beautiful-Ugly	2.14	1.50		1.64	2.00	
Intelligent-Ignorant	2.59	1.50		2.41	3.25	
Kind-Cruel	2.32	1.50		2.18	1.75	
Relaxed-Tense	2.82	3.00		2.05	2.25	
Valuable-Worthless	2.82	2.75		2.82	1.50	
Wise-Foolish	2.77	1.75		2.59	1.50	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.09	1.50		1.73	1.50	
Total Scale	2.40	1.84	.56	2.12	1.88	.24
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	5.00	2.75		5.05	2.25	
Hard-Soft	5.00	6.00		5.32	5.50	
Heavy-Light	4.73	5.75		4.50	6.00	
Rugged-Delicate	4.41	6.00		5.09	5.20	
Deep-Shallow	5.23	5.25		5.00	5.25	
Strong-Weak	3.23	2.25		3.55	4.00	
Healthy-Sick	2.68	1.50		2.36	2.25	
Total Scale	4.40	4.21	.19	4.41	4.35	.06
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	2.82	3.00		2.05	2.25	
Sharp-Dull	3.95	2.75		4.05	1.50	
Active-Passive	4.00	4.00		4.59	3.50	
Fast-Slow	4.55	4.20		4.05	4.00	
Total Scale	3.83	3.49	.34	3.69	2.81	.88

TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT DISADVANTAGED ACCORDING TO
ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test		D	Retest		D
	Black	Non-Black		Black	Non-Black	
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	2.18	1.25		1.68	1.50	
Beautiful-Ugly	2.00	1.75		2.45	2.25	
Intelligent-Ignorant	2.36	2.75		2.95	2.25	
Kind-Cruel	2.41	2.25		2.77	2.00	
Relaxed-Tense	2.18	3.00		2.32	1.75	
Valuable-Worthless	3.32	4.50		2.82	2.00	
Wise-Foolish	3.14	4.00		3.05	1.00	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.09	2.00		2.59	2.00	
Total Scale	2.46	2.69	.23	2.58	1.84	.74
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	5.41	4.50		5.23	2.25	
Hard-Soft	5.18	5.25		4.91	5.75	
Heavy-Light	4.68	4.75		4.95	5.75	
Rugged-Delicate	4.27	4.50		4.77	5.50	
Strong-Weak	3.36	2.25		3.09	3.25	
Healthy-Sick	3.27	2.25		3.05	1.50	
Total Scale	4.48	4.00	.48	4.47	4.32	.15
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	2.18	3.00		2.32	1.75	
Sharp-Dull	2.45	2.25		4.41	2.25	
Active-Passive	3.82	3.25		4.18	4.00	
Fast-Slow	3.18	3.25		4.55	3.50	
Total Scale	2.91	2.44		3.87	2.88	

TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT BLACK SELF-CONCEPT
ACCORDING TO ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	2.18	5.75		5.82	5.75	
Beautiful-Ugly	6.55	6.00		5.86	5.50	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.62	5.50		5.27	6.00	
Kind-Cruel	4.64	5.75		5.32	5.00	
Relaxed-Tense	4.27	4.50		4.82	4.00	
Valuable-Worthless	6.34	6.25		6.36	6.00	
Wise-Foolish	5.59	6.25		6.09	6.00	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.45	6.50		5.41	5.75	
Total Scale	5.08	5.81	.73	5.62	5.50	.12
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	4.55	4.00		5.22	4.50	
Hard-Soft	4.36	4.25		4.36	3.75	
Heavy-Light	4.50	4.25		4.23	4.25	
Rugged-Delicate	4.27	3.75		4.14	3.50	
Deep-Shallow	5.13	5.50		5.23	5.75	
Strong-Weak	6.18	5.50		5.18	5.75	
Healthy-Sick	5.34	5.25		5.73	6.25	
Total Scale	4.92	4.82	.10	4.87	4.82	.05
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	4.27	4.50		4.82	4.00	
Sharp-Dull	4.77	5.00		5.27	4.50	
Active-Passive	5.86	4.50		5.14	6.00	
Fast-Slow	4.64	4.00		4.86	6.00	
Total Scale	4.89	4.50	.39	5.02	5.13	.11

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT NEGRO ACCORDING TO
ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
Evaluative						
Good-Bad	6.14	6.25		6.14	6.00	
Beautiful-Ugly	6.18	6.00		5.95	6.00	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.91	5.75		6.14	6.00	
Kind-Cruel	5.18	5.50		5.23	6.00	
Relaxed-Tense	3.86	5.00		4.09	5.00	
Valuable-Worthless	5.64	6.25		5.73	6.25	
Wise-Foolish	5.63	6.25		5.36	6.00	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.77	6.25		4.77	6.25	
Total Scale	5.54	5.91	.47	5.43	5.94	.51
Potency						
Large-Small	4.41	4.25		4.86	4.50	
Hard-Soft	4.91	4.25		4.50	3.25	
Heavy-Light	4.59	5.25		4.55	3.25	
Rugged-Delicate	4.86	4.50		4.68	5.25	
Deep-Shallow	4.50	5.00		4.77	6.00	
Strong-Weak	5.73	5.25		5.73	4.50	
Healthy-Sick	4.91	6.00		5.27	5.50	
Total Scale	4.84	4.93	.09	4.91	4.61	.30
Activity						
Relaxed-Tense	3.86	5.00		4.09	5.00	
Sharp-Dull	4.91	5.25		4.68	4.00	
Active-Passive	4.54	4.75		5.45	5.25	
Fast-Slow	4.36	4.50		5.45	4.75	
Total Scale	4.42	4.88	.46	4.92	4.75	.17

TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT RACISM ACCORDING TO
ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	2.23	1.00		1.68	1.25	
Beautiful-Ugly	2.36	1.00		1.91	1.25	
Intelligent-Ignorant	3.14	1.00		2.68	1.00	
Kind-Cruel	2.00	1.25		1.77	1.25	
Relaxed-Tense	1.73	1.50		1.77	1.25	
Valuable-Worthless	2.68	1.00		2.36	1.00	
Wise-Foolish	2.27	1.00		2.27	1.00	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	1.86	1.00		1.82	1.00	
Total Scale	2.28	1.09	1.19	2.03	1.13	.90
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	4.86	3.75		4.86	3.00	
Hard-Soft	4.91	6.75		5.41	6.00	
Heavy-Light	4.64	6.75		5.23	6.00	
Rugged-Delicate	4.41	6.50		5.18	6.50	
Deep-Shallow	4.91	4.25		4.77	4.75	
Strong-Weak	4.41	3.50		3.23	2.50	
Healthy-Sick	2.36	1.00		2.45	1.00	
Total Scale	4.36	4.64	.28	4.45	4.25	.20
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	1.73	1.50		1.77	1.25	
Sharp-Dull	4.55	4.00		4.77	4.50	
Active-Passive	5.00	6.50		6.00	6.50	
Fast-Slow	3.77	5.25		4.68	5.25	
Total Scale	3.76	4.31	.55	4.31	4.38	.07

TABLE 24

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT SEPARATISM ACCORDING TO
ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non- Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	2.55	1.25		2.95	1.50	
Beautiful-Ugly	2.45	1.25		3.77	2.00	
Intelligent-Ignorant	3.09	1.50		3.95	1.75	
Kind-Cruel	2.91	1.25		3.45	1.75	
Relaxed-Tense	3.77	2.50		3.32	1.50	
Valuable-Worthless	3.05	1.50		3.91	2.00	
Wise-Foolish	2.77	1.25		3.86	1.75	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.55	2.25		4.18	1.25	
Total Scale	2.89	1.59	1.30	3.67	1.69	1.58
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	3.95	3.25		4.55	1.50	
Hard-Soft	4.45	5.00		4.36	6.00	
Heavy-Light	3.77	5.25		3.27	6.00	
Rugged-Delicate	4.00	4.75		4.68	5.25	
Deep-Shallow	4.00	4.25		4.05	2.75	
Strong-Weak	3.45	3.75		3.91	3.00	
Healthy-Sick	3.00	2.00		3.91	2.00	
Total Scale	3.80	4.04	.24	4.10	3.79	.31
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	3.77	2.50		3.32	1.50	
Sharp-Dull	4.14	4.75		4.32	3.50	
Active-Passive	4.73	4.75		4.73	5.50	
Fast-Slow	3.27	4.50		3.36	4.00	
Total Scale	3.98	4.13	.15	3.93	3.63	.30

TABLE 25

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT MILITANCE ACCORDING TO
ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	3.68	2.00		5.00	2.75	
Beautiful-Ugly	3.23	1.75		4.00	2.75	
Intelligent-Ignorant	4.64	3.25		4.86	3.00	
Kind-Cruel	3.73	1.75		3.50	2.50	
Relaxed-Tense	2.50	1.25		3.18	2.25	
Valuable-Worthless	4.32	4.00		5.41	4.50	
Wise-Foolish	4.00	6.00		4.91	4.25	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	3.32	2.50		3.86	3.25	
Total Scale	3.63	2.81	.87	4.34	3.16	1.18
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	4.23	2.50		4.00	3.25	
Hard-Soft	5.00	6.00		5.18	5.50	
Heavy-Light	4.77	5.50		4.41	5.00	
Rugged-Delicate	4.91	6.25		5.05	5.75	
Deep-Shallow	4.64	4.50		4.32	5.50	
Strong-Weak	5.36	5.75		4.95	5.00	
Healthy-Sick	3.64	6.25		4.91	4.25	
Total Scale	4.65	5.25	.60	4.69	4.89	.20
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	2.50	1.25		3.18	2.25	
Sharp-Dull	4.91	5.00		4.50	5.00	
Active-Passive	6.00	6.25		5.18	5.50	
Fast-Slow	4.77	5.25		4.73	6.25	
Total Scale	4.55	4.44	.11	4.40	4.75	.35

TABLE 26

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT REVOLUTION ACCORDING TO
ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	4.32	1.50		4.73	3.25	
Beautiful-Ugly	3.45	1.50		3.86	2.75	
Intelligent-Ignorant	4.91	4.25		4.68	3.75	
Kind-Cruel	4.27	2.00		3.91	2.75	
Relaxed-Tense	2.36	1.25		2.77	2.75	
Valuable-Worthless	5.55	4.00		5.45	3.75	
Wise-Foolish	5.45	3.75		4.86	3.25	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.86	2.00		3.27	2.50	
Total Scale	4.15	2.53	1.62	4.19	3.09	1.10
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	3.95	5.00		4.59	3.25	
Hard-Soft	5.36	6.00		5.00	5.75	
Heavy-Light	4.68	6.00		4.82	5.75	
Rugged-Delicate	5.09	6.25		5.64	6.25	
Deep-Shallow	4.77	5.50		4.50	5.75	
Strong-Weak	5.32	5.50		4.32	6.25	
Healthy-Sick	4.64	3.75		4.45	3.50	
Total Scale	4.83	5.43	.60	4.76	5.21	.45
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	2.36	1.25		2.77	2.75	
Sharp-Dull	4.95	5.75		4.86	6.00	
Active-Passive	5.54	6.25		5.64	6.00	
Fast-Slow	4.41	5.25		5.00	6.00	
Total Scale	4.32	4.63	.31	4.57	5.19	.62

TABLE 27

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT WELFARE ACCORDING TO ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	4.27	5.50		3.32	5.75	
Beautiful-Ugly	3.36	4.75		3.09	5.00	
Intelligent-Ignorant	4.14	4.50		3.86	5.50	
Kind-Cruel	3.45	5.00		3.23	4.50	
Relaxed-Tense	3.32	3.75		3.18	4.00	
Valuable-Worthless	5.32	5.75		5.00	5.25	
Wise-Foolish	3.95	6.25		5.05	5.50	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	3.95	3.75		3.59	4.00	
Total Scale	3.97	4.91	.94	3.79	4.94	.15
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	4.73	4.25		5.18	4.25	
Hard-Soft	4.23	4.25		4.50	4.50	
Heavy-Light	4.14	4.25		4.36	5.00	
Rugged-Delicate	4.14	4.00		4.64	4.00	
Deep-Shallow	4.68	5.00		4.55	4.50	
Strong-Weak	3.95	5.25		3.55	4.75	
Healthy-Sick	4.27	5.50		4.55	5.25	
Total Scale	4.31	4.79	.48	4.48	4.61	.13
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	3.32	3.75		3.18	4.00	
Sharp-Dull	4.86	4.25		3.82	5.25	
Active-Passive	4.64	4.50		4.25	4.50	
Fast-Slow	3.82	3.75		4.64	4.75	
Total Scale	4.16	4.06	.10	3.98	4.63	.65

TABLE 28

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT THE ESTABLISHMENT ACCORLING TO
ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	3.68	4.00		2.59	4.25	
Beautiful-Ugly	3.32	4.00		2.50	3.50	
Intelligent-Ignorant	4.50	5.00		4.59	4.50	
Kind-Cruel	2.95	5.00		2.68	4.00	
Relaxed-Tense	3.27	3.25		3.05	4.00	
Valuable-Worthless	4.82	4.50		3.68	4.50	
Wise-Foolish	4.27	4.00		3.91	4.00	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	3.41	4.00		3.14	4.25	
Total Scale	3.78	4.72	.94	3.27	4.13	.86
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	4.95	5.00		4.86	4.25	
Hard-Soft	4.82	4.75		4.77	3.50	
Heavy-Light	4.50	4.75		4.77	4.50	
Rugged-Delicate	4.82	3.75		4.77	4.75	
Strong-Weak	4.82	4.50		4.59	4.75	
Healthy-Sick	3.77	4.00		3.41	3.75	
Total Scale	4.51	4.64	.13	4.47	4.18	.29
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	3.27	3.25		3.05	4.00	
Sharp-Dull	4.82	5.00		4.50	5.00	
Active-Passive	4.95	6.00		4.68	5.50	
Fast-Slow	4.00	5.00		3.91	4.75	
Total Scale	4.26	4.81	.55	4.04	4.81	.77

TABLE 29

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT BLACK POWER ACCORDING TO
ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test		D	Retest		D
	Black	Non-Black		Black	Non-Black	
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	5.00	5.25		5.32	4.50	
Beautiful-Ugly	5.32	5.50		4.95	4.25	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.22	5.50		5.18	5.25	
Kind-Cruel	4.55	4.50		4.32	3.75	
Relaxed-Tense	3.32	3.50		4.00	3.50	
Valuable-Worthless	6.09	6.00		5.86	5.50	
Wise-Foolish	5.45	6.00		6.00	4.75	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.32	5.75		5.05	4.75	
Total Scale	5.03	5.25	.22	5.04	4.53	.56
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	4.55	5.00		4.73	4.00	
Hard-Soft	4.55	4.75		4.73	5.50	
Heavy-Light	4.41	4.75		4.36	5.25	
Rugged-Delicate	5.23	4.50		3.95	6.00	
Deep-Shallow	4.68	5.75		4.86	5.50	
Strong-Weak	5.68	5.75		5.64	5.75	
Healthy-Sick	4.95	5.75		5.27	4.75	
Total Scale	4.66	5.18	.32	4.78	5.25	.47
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	3.32	3.50		4.00	3.50	
Sharp-Dull	5.18	5.50		5.55	4.25	
Active-Passive	5.95	5.50		5.59	6.00	
Fast-Slow	4.68	6.00		4.68	6.25	
Total Scale	4.78	5.13	.35	4.96	5.00	.04

TABLE 30

COMPARISON OF MEAN RATINGS OF THE CONCEPT AFRICAN ACCORDING TO
ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

Scale	Test			Retest		
	Black	Non-Black	D	Black	Non-Black	D
<u>Evaluative</u>						
Good-Bad	5.41	5.50		6.27	6.00	
Beautiful-Ugly	5.91	5.75		5.91	5.50	
Intelligent-Ugly	6.00	5.75		6.32	6.00	
Kind-Cruel	4.86	5.50		4.91	6.00	
Relaxed-Tense	4.09	4.25		4.45	5.00	
Valuable-Worthless	6.00	6.00		6.05	6.00	
Wise-Foolish	5.55	5.50		5.62	5.75	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.27	5.75		5.82	6.25	
Total Scale	5.39	5.50	.11	5.67	5.81	.14
<u>Potency</u>						
Large-Small	4.95	5.75		5.41	5.25	
Hard-Soft	4.55	4.75		4.34	4.75	
Heavy-Light	4.18	4.00		4.64	4.00	
Rugged-Delicate	4.64	4.75		5.05	5.25	
Deep-Shallow	5.00	4.75		5.09	5.25	
Strong-Weak	5.27	6.00		5.59	5.75	
Healthy-Sick	5.27	6.00		5.73	6.00	
Total Scale	4.84	5.14	.70	5.12	5.18	.06
<u>Activity</u>						
Relaxed-Tense	4.09	4.25		4.45	5.00	
Sharp-Dull	5.09	5.50		4.95	5.00	
Active-Passive	5.05	5.00		5.73	6.00	
Fast-Slow	4.45	5.00		4.86	5.50	
Total Scale	4.67	4.94	.27	5.00	5.38	.38

TABLE 31

CHANGES FROM PRE-INSTITUTE TO POST-INSTITUTE IN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL
JUDGEMENTS FOR PARTICIPANTS ACCORDING TO ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

(The sign represents the direction of change and the value represents the magnitude of the change)

Concept	Changes on					
	<u>Evaluation</u>		<u>Potency</u>		<u>Activity</u>	
	Black	Non-Black	Black	Non-Black	Black	Non-Black
Poverty	+(.19)	- (.16)	+(.26)	+(.36)	+(.63)	+(.62)
Cultural Deprivation	- (.28)	+(.04)	- (.32)	+(.20)	- (.50)	- (.20)
The Disadvantaged	+(.12)	- (.85)	+(.01)	+(.32)	+(.96)	- (.06)
Black Self-Concept	+(.54)	- (.31)	- (.05)	None	+(.13)	+(.63)
Negro	- (.11)	+(.03)	+(.07)	- (.32)	+(.50)	+(.13)
Racism	- (.25)	+(.04)	+(.09)	- (.39)	+(.55)	+(.07)
Separatism	+(.78)	+(.10)	+(.30)	- (.25)	+(.05)	- (.50)
Militance	+(.54)	+(.75)	+(.04)	- (.36)	- (.15)	+(.31)
Revolution	+(.04)	+(.56)	- (.07)	- (.22)	+(.25)	+(.56)
Welfare	- (.18)	+(.03)	+(.17)	- (.18)	- (.18)	+(.57)
Establishment	- (.51)	- (.54)	- (.04)	- (.54)	- (.22)	None
Black Power	+(.06)	- (.72)	- (.08)	- (.07)	+(.18)	- (.13)
African	+(.28)	+(.31)	+(.28)	+(.04)	+(.33)	+(.44)

TABLE 32

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "POVERTY"
AS RATED PRE-and POST-TEACHING ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL BY STUDENTS

Scale	Pre-Teaching M	Post-Teaching M	D*
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	1.83	1.90	
Beautiful-Ugly	2.07	2.15	
Intelligent-Ignorant	2.85	2.63	
Kind-Cruel	2.28	2.21	
Relaxed-Tense	2.46	2.40	
Valuable-Worthless	2.38	2.36	
Wise-Foolish	2.66	2.53	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.11	2.04	
Total Scale	2.33	2.28	.009
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.40	4.31	
Hard-Soft	5.45	5.20	
Heavy-Light	5.00	5.11	
Rugged-Delicate	5.04	5.16	
Deep-Shallow	4.55	4.59	
Strong-Weak	3.40	3.37	
Healthy-Sick	2.62	2.55	
Total Scale	4.35	4.33	.102
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	2.46	2.40	
Sharp-Dull	3.46	3.90	
Active-Passive	4.50	4.77	
Fast-Slow	4.40	4.56	
Total Scale	3.71	3.91	.172
*Based on Mean Scores			

TABLE 33

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "NEGRO"
AS RATED PRE-AND POST-TEACHING ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL BY STUDENTS

Scale	Pre-Teaching	Post-Teaching	D*
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	5.39	5.43	
Beautiful-Ugly	5.38	5.42	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.33	5.13	
Kind-Cruel	4.92	4.90	
Relaxed-Tense	4.34	4.37	
Valuable-Worthless	5.86	5.68	
Wise-Foolish	5.20	5.10	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.06	4.97	
Total Scale	5.19	5.13	.030
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.77	4.89	
Hard-Soft	5.13	4.95	
Heavy-Light	5.13	5.13	
Rugged-Delicate	5.48	5.17	
Deep-Shallow	4.72	4.96	
Strong-Weak	5.74	5.83	
Healthy-Sick	5.10	5.40	
Total Scale	5.15	5.19	.031
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	4.34	4.37	
Sharp-Dull	4.95	4.97	
Active-Passive	5.42	5.27	
Fast-Slow	5.38	5.35	
Total Scale	5.02	4.99	.001

*Based on Mean Scores

TABLE 34

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPT "RACISM"
AS RATED PRE-AND POST-TEACHING ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC
DIFFERENTIAL BY STUDENTS

Scale	Pre-Teaching M	Post-Teaching M	D*
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	2.94	3.01	
Beautiful-Ugly	3.03	3.03	
Intelligent-Ignorant	3.46	3.34	
Kind-Cruel	4.06	3.00	
Relaxed-Tense	2.81	2.88	
Valuable-Worthless	5.35	3.31	
Wise-Foolish	3.23	3.21	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	2.85	3.03	
Total Scale	3.47	3.10	.231
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	5.38	5.11	
Hard-Soft	5.11	4.87	
Heavy-Light	5.06	4.64	
Rugged-Delicate	5.07	5.82	
Deep-Shallow	4.71	4.62	
Strong-Weak	4.56	4.23	
Healthy-Sick	3.44	3.43	
Total Scale	4.75	4.67	.031
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	2.81	2.88	
Sharp-Dull	4.83	4.52	
Active-Passive	4.38	5.24	
Fast-Slow	4.99	4.59	
Total Scale	4.25	4.31	.016

*Based on Mean Scores

TABLE 35

MEAN RATINGS AND DIFFERENCES IN ALLOCATION (O) OF THE CONCEPT "AFRICA" //
 AS RATED PRE AND POST-TEACHING IN THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC
 D DIFFERENTIAL BY STUDENTS

Scale	Pre-Teaching M	Post-Teaching M	D *
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	5.85	5.52	
Beautiful-Ugly	5.67	5.35	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.62	5.37	
Kind-Cruel	5.24	5.03	
Relaxed-Tense	4.77	4.30	
Valuable-Worthless	6.17	5.57	
Wise-Foolish	5.80	5.28	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.06	4.84	
Total Scale	5.52	5.16	.107
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	5.62	5.43	
Hard-Soft	5.40	5.07	
Heavy-Light	5.11	5.23	
Rugged-Delicate	5.74	5.43	
Deep-Shallow	4.99	4.77	
Strong-Weak	6.20	5.67	
Healthy-Sick	5.70	5.18	
Total Scale	5.54	5.52	.008
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	4.77	4.30	
Sharp-Dull	5.10	4.91	
Active-Passive	5.78	5.61	
Fast-Slow	5.49	5.23	
Total Scale	5.29	5.01	.006

*Based on Mean Scores

TABLE 36

CHANGES FROM PRE-TEACHING TO POST-TEACHING IN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL JUDGEMENTS
FOR STUDENTS

(The sign represents the direction of change and the value represents the magnitude of change.)

Concept	Evaluation	Change On	
		Potency	Activity
Poverty	$-(.05)$	$+(.26)$	$+(.20)$
Negro	$-(.06)$	$+(.04)$	$-(.04)$
Racism	$-(.37)$	$-(.08)$	$+(.06)$
African	$-(.36)$	$-(.29)$	$-(.28)$

TABLE 37

DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPTS OF "NEGRO" AND "AFRICAN"
ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AS RATED PRE-INSTITUTE
BY PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Negro M	African M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	6.15	5.42	
Beautiful-Ugly	6.15	5.88	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.88	5.96	
Kind-Cruel	5.23	4.96	
Relaxed-Tense	4.04	4.12	
Valuable-Worthless	6.58	6.00	
Wise-Foolish	5.73	5.54	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.85	5.35	
Total Scale	5.70	5.40	.114
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.38	5.08	
Hard-Soft	4.38	4.58	
Heavy-Light	4.69	4.15	
Rugged-Delicate	4.81	5.65	
Deep-Shallow	4.58	4.96	
Strong-Weak	5.65	5.38	
Healthy-Sick	5.08	5.38	
Total Scale	4.80	5.03	.105
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	4.04	4.12	
Sharp-Dull	4.96	5.15	
Active-Passive	5.35	5.04	
Fast-Slow	4.38	4.54	
Total Scale	4.68	4.71	.012

TABLE 38

DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPTS OF "NEGRO" AND "AFRICAN"
ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AS RATED POST-INSTITUTE
BY PARTICIPANTS

Scale	Negro M	African M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	6.12	6.23	
Beautiful-Ugly	5.96	5.85	
Intelligent-Ignorant	6.12	6.27	
Kind-Cruel	5.14	5.08	
Relaxed-Tense	4.23	4.54	
Valuable-Worthless	5.81	6.04	
Wise-Foolish	5.46	5.69	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.00	5.88	
Total Scale	5.48	5.70	.101
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.81	5.38	
Hard-Soft	4.31	4.69	
Heavy-Light	4.35	4.54	
Rugged-Delicate	4.77	5.08	
Deep-Shallow	4.96	5.12	
Strong-Weak	5.54	5.62	
Healthy-Sick	5.31	5.73	
Total Scale	4.25	5.16	
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	4.23	4.54	
Sharp-Dull	4.58	4.96	
Active-Passive	5.42	5.77	
Fast-Slow	4.58	4.96	
Total Scale	4.70	5.06	.023

TABLE 39

DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPTS OF "NEGRO" AND "AFRICAN" ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AS RATED PRE-TEACHING BY STUDENTS

Scale	Negro M	African M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	5.39	5.85	
Beautiful-Ugly	5.38	5.67	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.33	5.62	
Kind-Cruel	4.92	5.24	
Relaxed-Tense	4.34	4.77	
Valuable-Worthless	5.86	6.17	
Wise-Foolish	5.20	5.80	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	5.06	5.06	
Total Scale	5.19	5.52	.105
<u>Patency</u>			
Large-Small	4.77	5.62	
Hard-Soft	5.13	5.40	
Heavy-Light	5.13	5.11	
Rugged-Delicate	5.48	5.74	
Deep- Shallow	4.72	4.99	
Strong-Weak	5.74	6.20	
Healthy-Sick	5.10	5.70	
Total Scale	5.15	5.54	.127
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	4.34	4.77	
Sharp-Dull	4.95	5.10	
Active-Passive	5.42	5.78	
Fast-Slow	5.38	5.49	
Total Scale	5.02	5.29	.002

TABLE 40

DIFFERENCES IN THE ALLOCATION (D) OF THE CONCEPTS OF "NEGRO" AND "AFRICAN"
ON THE THREE SCALES OF THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL AS RATED POST-TEACHING
BY STUDENTS

Scale	Negro M	African M	D
<u>Evaluative</u>			
Good-Bad	5.43	5.52	
Beautiful-Ugly	5.42	5.35	
Intelligent-Ignorant	5.13	5.37	
Kind-Cruel	4.90	5.03	
Relaxed-Tense	4.37	4.30	
Valuable-Worthless	5.68	5.57	
Wise-Foolish	5.10	5.28	
Pleasant-Unpleasant	4.97	4.89	
Total Scale	5.13	5.16	.119
<u>Potency</u>			
Large-Small	4.89	5.43	
Hard-Soft	4.95	5.07	
Heavy-Light	5.13	5.23	
Rugged-Delicate	5.17	5.43	
Deep-Shallow	4.96	4.77	
Strong-Weak	5.83	5.67	
Healthy-Sick	5.40	5.18	
Total Scale	5.19	5.25	.020
<u>Activity</u>			
Relaxed-Tense	4.37	4.30	
Sharp-Dull	4.97	4.91	
Active-Passive	5.27	5.61	
Fast-Slow	5.35	5.23	
Total Scale	4.99	5.01	.001